

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,498	09/24/2001	Masakazu Tanaka	12-008	7238	
23400	7590 07/13/2005	•	EXAMINER		
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC 12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE			BOS, ST	BOS, STEVEN J	
SUITE 101	I LITTLES DICEVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA	A 20191		1754		

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				_
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/960,498	TANAKA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Steven Bos	1754		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence ad	ldress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timel from the mailing date of this c ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Fe</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters,		e ments is	
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-16,19-32 and 42-49</u> is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1,5,9,11-16,20,22,23,26-32,48 and 48</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>2-4,6,7,10,19,21,24,25 and 42-47</u> is/a 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration. g is/are rejected. are objected to.			
Application Papers		•		
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 	epted or b) objected to by t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. tion is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 C	, ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Appli rity documents have been rec u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No eeived in this National	Stage	
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		mary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application (PT0	O-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/960,498

Art Unit: 1754

In claims 7, 47, "kind" is awkward and should be replaced with – metal --. In claim 15, -- a – needs to be inserted between "with" and "metal".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,5,9,11,22,23,30,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, "the catalyst metal" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 5, "the catalyst metal" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 9, "the catalyst metal" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 11, "the catalyst metal" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 22, "the catalyst that receives catalyst poisoning" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 23, "the substrate ceramic" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 30, "the substrate ceramic" lack(s) proper antecedent basis in the claim(s).

In claim 32, proper Markush language needs to be used otherwise the claim is indefinite as to its metes and bounds.

Application/Control Number: 09/960,498

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 20,22,26-31,48,49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deeba '910.

Application/Control Number: 09/960,498

Art Unit: 1754

Deeba teaches the ceramic catalyst body comprising a cordierite carrier, which would have a substrate having a crystal lattice since a substrate comprising cordierite is instantly claimed, and therefore would be capable of supporting a catalyst directly on the substrate, the carrier having a catalyst component supported thereon, eg. palladium, platinum, rhodium, and having a trapping component supported on the end face of the carrier to provide a trap layer. See Figs. 2,3, cols. 6,7,9,16,17. The taught Figs. 2,3 are substantially identical to the instant Figs. 4a and 5a. The taught ceramic catalyst body has multiple zones each having catalysts which would perform as decomposition catalysts which are near to catalysts that would receive catalyst poisoning. The carrier has a plurality of fine gas flow passages, ie. pores.

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naito '835 or WO 99/19060. Naito is an English equivalent of WO 99/19060.

Naito and WO '060 teach the ceramic catalyst body comprising a cordierite carrier, which would have a substrate having a crystal lattice since a substrate comprising cordierite is instantly claimed, and therefore would be capable of supporting a catalyst directly on the substrate, the carrier having catalyst particles supported thereon, the catalyst particles containing a metal on the outer surface thereof. The ceramic carrier has a plurality of pores which directly support the catalyst particles. See Figs. 1,9, cols. 4,9,10 of Naito.

Art Unit: 1754

Applicant's arguments filed February 3, 2005 have been fully considered and are persuasive but they are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Bos whose telephone number is 571-272-1350. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8AM-6PM but is on increased flexitime sch.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Bos

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1754